The White Paper and Alberta Politics

Tom Bateman
Legislative Intern, 1984-85

July, 1985

Introduction

The recent retirement announcement of Premier Peter Lougheed will no doubt initiate the accumulation of a large body of literature assessing his affect on Alberta over the last twenty years, the wisdom of his actions and policies, and the prospects for the future without him at the helm. Such analyses will be based on the attractive assumption that he alone is the focus of government policy, party strength, and provincial development in the past fourteen years during which he has been Premier. While this assumption ignores the many influences on his thoughts and initiatives, for purposes of convenience, if for no other, it is useful to speak of the Lougheed government.

This paper is a tentative contribution to the stack of analyses that will soon form on the Lougheed years. It is a tentative contribution because it concentrates on one of the last major initiatives under Mr. Lougheed's Premiership which is not yet complete and whose wisdom will not truly be apparent for another several years. This initiative is what has come to be known as the 'white paper process.'

The process began on March 15, 1984. The Speech from the Throne contained the following in its conclusion:

> During the spring the government plans to present a paper setting forth an Economic Strategy for Alberta, for consideration by the citizens of the province. The document will reassess Alberta's current economic strategy and propose possible shifts in emphasis for the decade ahead.

Subsequently, on July 11, 1984, Premier Lougheed, in a speech to the Edmonton Chamber of Commerce, spoke on the white paper, entitled "Proposals for an Industrial and Science Strategy for Albertans: 1985 - 1990." The paper was released on the same day. The government has chosen to issue a white paper on industrial strategy, he said, because "we believe it is worthwhile for the business community. labour, and citizens at large to realize that the government has a comprehensive

plan for the future from and industrial and science point of view.... We recognize that our current strategy has served us well since 1971 but so many changes have occurred that it has been timely to make the effort to have an updates industrial strategy"[1]

The release of the white paper set off a process of consultation and policy formulation rare among Canadian provinces. Because this process is rare at the provincial level (and, for that matter, at the federal level, as regards industrial policy), we may suspect that there reasons peculiar to the Alberta economic and political context that are behind its emergence in this province. While partisan critics of the government saw the white paper as a "strategy of desperation," a "rationalization of the Tory failure to diversify the Alberta economy,"[2] a more detached analysis sees the roots of the white paper -- and the long consultative process flowing from it -- in the government's attempts to relate and respond to the Alberta electorate in a manner whose effectiveness is normally provided for by a strong, sizeable, and viable opposition in the Legislature; and in the Alberta perspective on federal-provincial relations which has developed in part from the province's experience of genuine economic power. This paper will look at the white paper process with a view to bringing to light these underlying factors.

The White Paper and the White Paper Process

In political affairs, it is often difficult to clearly separate form from content, process from substance, since techniques, being inherently limiting, define or at least delimit results; and conversely, since desired ends often influence the selection of means employed to attain them. This is true of the subject under discussion. Nonetheless, distinctions can be made between the white paper itself and the consultative process stemming from it. An appreciation of this distinction will help us understand the various functions the Alberta government had the white paper process perform.

The white paper is a summary analysis of the Alberta economy, its rengths, weaknesses, potential for diversification, and prospects for the future. It was written with a view to setting the terms of the debate over the course the Alberta government should take to enhance or promote structural change in the economy. Thus, substantive policy proposals are advanced for the development of the provincial economy, in recognition of the fact that, given a set of objective economic and political conditions, different strategies may present themselves, or be presented, as viable alternatives.

Most of the proposals concern the extent to which the provincial government should lead the economy to a more diversifies level of development. It is assumed that a diversified economy is better than a staple led or single industry one, but it is not assumed that the government's role in the diversification of the economy is universally agreed upon. Hence among the central questions to be addressed by respondents to the white paper proposals are the following: "Should the Provincial Government remain active and supportive of the Alberta econom or become more passive , and concentrate primarily on encouraging a good climate for private sector investment?"[3] "Should the Provincial Government select specific sectors or areas for special support and encouragement or should it take a very standback towards economic development?"[4] "Should the Alberta Government abandon its current policy of providing no specific preference to local suppliers, contractors and others on tendered purchases and contracts?"[5]

In answer to these questions the government proposes to "take even bolder action" in developing with the private sector large-scale projects that the private sector alone would not undertake; to select special areas for support, especially high technology, whose development is not constrained by such factors as geography, climate, and resource supply; and to "develop its own Alberta procurement policy to give advantage and preference to Alberta based suppliers and contractors."[6] In the white paper are found proposals to more aggressively market Alberta products

internationally; to increase food processing in theprovince; to step up the supply, marketing, and transportation of petrochemicals; to make education more responsive to market opportunities in the Alberta context; and to enhance the provision of equity capital for small and medium size business. This is not a comprehensive list of the proposals. It is long enough, though, to illustrate the government's willingness to support and cooperate with the private sector in developing a more diversifies provincial economy.

A few points of significance must be mentioned for the purposes of this paper. The first stems from the need for an industrial strategy and is manifested in the contents of the white paper. It is that the Alberta economy is understood to a great extent as one that largely affected by external influences; that, if action is not taken, the economy will be driven by external forces and decisions to an intolerable degree. Indeed, the emphasis on the "Alberta" economy begs a sober consideration of all that can and does influence it from beyond the province's borders. A useful analogy would be the attribution of adult status to a child, then to enumerate all the ways in which this adult displays child-like qualities. The point here is that there is a consistent provincialism permeating the white paper.

The second point is related to the first. It is simply that remedial efforts are assumed to be necessary, and that the debate principally arises over the form such action should take. Government action is assumed to be part of the solution; after all, "governments everywhere are involved in varying degrees."[7] Every government, therefore, has an industrial strategy of some sort. Among other things, its extent depends on "the way in which the government assists or coop erates with the private sector to accomplish overall economic objectives and growth."[8]

A final point to be made about the white paper is that government action is warranted not only to enhance the market and provide a stable environment in which business can operate; it is also justified to counter other governments' interventions which adversely affect Alberta. - Hence the mention of procurement policies and the National Energy Program.

This sort of justification brings the white paper within the ambit of federal-provincial relations, as we will see below.

We turn now from a brief outline of the contents of the white paper to the whole process of which the actual document is only the starting point. The first question that must be answered is why the government chose the white paper as a means of industrial strategy formulation.

In the Canadian parliamentary system, the use of coloured papers in general and white papers in particular has occurred mainly at the federal level. Historically they played an infirmational role; but in the 1960s they took the form of policy-making instruments.[9] This new role is traceable at the federal level to the circumstances under which the Pearson government functioned and to the consultative manner of the Prime Minister himself. Major initiatives required the active garnering of support in the Liberal minority government. White papers became an instrument with which proposals were publicized for comment and criticism. They became barometers of opinion and mechanisms for the refinement of policy.

Under Prime Minister Trudeau, white papers developed into tools of "participatory democracy," a formalization of the process of two-way communication. White papers came to be used for longer-range planning as well.[10]

Given the functions of the white paper, it was appropriate for the Alberta government to package its proposals for an industrial strategy in this form. Industrial strategy to be effective requires a great degree of coordination and consultation with with not only component industries of an economy but even with component firms.[11] Participants in the economy are not likely to cooperate with the government's industrial policy both if they do not know its contents and rationale and if they have had no input into its formulation. This latter point is particularly true in a province where fundamental reliance on the private sector as the engine of the economy is still unquestioned.

In addition, the Alberta government, more than any province in Canada, is safe in laying out a set of proposals which it knows will stimulate a lot of criticism. Indeed, the government has been almost universally applauded for engaging the public in this honest, forthright debate. It has the security to undertake an open study of a subject that is always the subject of heated partisan conflict. More on the relation between the white paper process and the solicitation of opposing views will be discussed below.

The white paper received wide distribution. Thousands of copies were sent to points within and without Alberta -- to interest groups, firms, individuals, and political and governmental figures. By September plans were finalized to have a steering committe composed of three cabinet ministers and one MLA to travel the province and conduct forums on the white paper.[12] Advertisements were run in newspapers inviting interested parties to make representations. As the advertisements put it: "Priority will be given to province-wide organizations...," though individuals' requests to appear would be given consideration. The advertisements also said: "Individuals wishing to make their views known are encouraged to do sothrough their MLA who will make arrangements to meet with them. Government MLAs will be advertising locally when they will be available to meet with individuals."

This dual-input mechanism -- public forums for province-wide organizations; MLA meetings with individuals -- was a rather unique arrangement; an attempt perhaps to supplement the elite accommodation style of policy formulation. It is almost impossible to guess how many persons contacted their MLAs on the white paper, but we do know that 5% of submissions made at the public forums were made by individuals

The public forums were the visible, more publicized part of the response process. Other submissions were received at the forums, by MLAs, by the Premier's Office, and the Department of Economic Development, and took the form of essays and letters -- no doubt phone calls and brief conversations as well. It is impossible to quantify the amount and

type of responses. It can safely be said though that ample opportunity was given to individuals and organizations to respond to the white paper proposals, and we suspect anything else that was thought to be of sufficient importance. In fact, last year the Edmonton Journal reported Mr. Lougheed's executive assistant as saying that only two individuals were told that they could not be accommodated at the forums. (One Organization, CUPE, was also refused a place, reportedly because it applied for a spot one day too late.)

The steering committee oversaw the creation of a number of task forces, each assigned the responsibility of reviewing the responses to the white paper, consulting the private and public sectors, and drawing up draft position statements on their respective sub-areas of the industrial strategy. Each task force, or "internal group,"[14] wos constructed to be headed by a member of the government, through whom each task force's draft statement could be presented to the steering committee, cabinet, and finally caucus.

One policy statement has been released to date: The "Position and Policy Statement on Tourism." The press release accompanying the statement details the structure and function of the task force on tourism:

> (The responses to the white paper) led Premier Lougheed to appoint a Task Force on tourism in January, 1985, which consisted of members from both the private and public sectors. The Task Force drew upon private sector responses to the white paper in order to undertake a comprehensive review of tourism in Alberta which covered history, development, training, marketing, world position and future potential.15

Similarly, the task force on capital markets and financial infrastructure has had representation from both sectors and has drawn heavily upon the information provided by respondnets to the white paper proposals.[16] Other task forces dealing with other sub-areas probably are of the same nature.

The White Paper and the Lougheed Government

The stress the Premier place on planning has been noted in the introduction to this paper. Rational Planning is infact desirable for anyone, he thinks. Th white paper process is in many respects the quintessential exercise in planning, as it has drawn on many and diverse sources on information and opinion, subjected this information to close, specialized analysis, clearing the output finally with the full caucus. Clearly the attempt was made to alienate as few groups as possible. Even the Young Communist League had its say.

This exercise in popular policy input is traceable to several factors. The first is the populist element in Alberta politics. In all cases in the past, and especially in this one, the government has stressed that it was/is acting on behalf of Albertans, a claim so often repeated that it is conspicuous by its absence in any government brochure, Ministerial answer in Question Period, or speech by a Private Member. "Albertans" is contained in the title of the white paper -- no surprise.

Combined with this basic populism is the fact that the formulation of an industrial strategy , as was mentioned above, requires consultation and coordination with all sectors of the economy. The imperatives of populism and industrial policy formulation when combined form a vigouroud exchange between government and citizens: the understanding by both parties is that the result of such an exchange could be a more resilient, autonomous Alberta, the fruition of a dream that extends into Alberta's past. The Lougheed government has succeeded by positiing itself as the province's official spokesman not only to other jurisdictions but also to itself.

There is some fairly objective evidence supporting the notion that the Lougheed government <u>is</u> the province's spokesman; notably that 74 of 79 seats in the Assembly are occupied by government Members, and that the popular vote for the Progressive Conservative Party in the past three general elections has not been below 57% of votes cast.This leads to a more profound explanation for the lengths to which the government has gone to solicit individual and group response to the white paper proposals. The

government has had, in a sense, to create its own opposition -- or aggressively seek out that opposition -- and respond to that opposition in order to adapt an economic strategy in basic accord with the views of individuals and groups in Alberta. This point needs elaboration.

The embarrassment of riches enjoyed by the governing party has on the one hand relieved it from the pressures and disciplines forced on it by a strong, viable opposition in the Assembly. This is not a reflection on the competence of individual opposition Members, but simply a statement of the insurmountable difficulty a four person, two party opposition has in keeping tabs on a government with one of the highest per capita annual budgets of any province. Its small size also makes it difficult fot the opposition to articulate the complaints and alternative views of those not in full agreement with the government's policies. Perhaps many people are more willing to grin and bear Tory government than commit themselves to the present alternatives.

On the other hand, the absence of viable intra-Legislature opposition invites the government to become lazy, arrogant, and insensitive to changing economic and political realities outside the Assembly. The government has therefore had to implement several techniques and structures to provide its Members with the discipline and initiative required for healthy government, which are normally provided by viable opposition. Mr. Lougheed has always had before him an example of the political failures to which an ignorance of changing realities leads: the decline of Social Credit in Alberta.

One central innovation Premier Lougheed created to stave off the fate that befell the Social Credit Party is the Tory caucus model.[17] One of the main reasons for the vigourous system is the overwheling majority in the Assembly: "To put it bluntly," Professor McCormick writes, "there are problems in keeping such a large caucus under control (the more so as the threat of actual defeat in the House is hardly credible)."[18]

Other techniques employed are extensive travel requirements, summer ministerial tours of the province being a case in point; and ample

provision of research services to the Members (of which the Legislative Internship Program is a part). Members are kept busy, and considerable effort is made to enable them to reflect the concerns of the constituents they represent. Professor McCormick reports that the Members he interviewed felt that full caucus has a lot of power and exercises some control over cabinet. All indications are that sincere debate occurs in caucus; if so, then we have a structure that has internalized opposition. What we do know is that the Conservatives have kept in step with trends in Alberta: they still have a tight hold on Alberta politics.

Upon analyzing the specifics of the white paper process, we can conclude that it is very much a part of the internalization of the function of opposition the Lougheed government has effected. The caucus task force, McCormick writes, is one of the committee types that constitutes the government caucus system; and it appears that what is known as the white paper steering committee is really a manifestation of the caucus task force. The caucus task force is composed of a small number of private Members and Ministers; it is created "to deal with specific pressing issues when time is a critical factor."[19] As regards the white paper process, time was and is not "critical." Economic strategy has meaning and application in the medium and long terms. McCormick's conception certainly admits of enough flexibility to encompass white paper steering committee.

The stress on public presentation and debate, the accommodation of individuals and groups, and the digestion of all submissions all are meant for the government to formulate a reasonable and fairly representative strategy which it otherwise may have been able to formulate without the use of the white paper process if an effective intra-Legislture opposition existed. Just as the government may refuse to listen to opposition parties, so in this case it may refuse to listen to many of the made to the steering committee and other bodies. The responsibility lies with the government. Time will tell how well it has operationalized the views of major segments of the economy.

That the white paper process performs this opposition internalization function is evidences as well by the government's reluctance to establish a provincial economic council, a plan advocated by the NDP for years. In the Spring Sitting of the present Session, Opposition Leader Ray Martin introduced Bill 211, the Alberta Economic Council Act, the purpose of which is to "suggest that we need a mechanism or vehicle in this province to make sure that our economy going to be diversified and that there are going to be opportunities and jobs in the future."[20]

The bill calls for an advisory council to operate at arm's length from government, to conduct "dispassionate and impartial inquiry" into the economy and make recommendations to the government for the "long-term growth and prosperity" thereof. In second reading debate, Mr. Martin argued that the government made a crucial step in the right direction by recognizing the need for economic planning, as evidenced in the white paper. However, it has not gone far enough, he said; the white paper in its concept is another example of government "ad hockery." An economic council would "make that plan (the economic strategy) more effective.... It seems to me that there should be some planning besides what the government is doing -- an agency that's arm's length from the government to advise the government."[21] The key to making wise decisions "is to have as much input and feed-in from outside the Legislature as possible...;" after all, "the task is just too important to be left solely in the hands of the government of the day."[22] The NDP proposal, then, was to institutionalize the white paper process and remove it from the activity of the governing party. The responsibility of government would enter when it would decide to implement or ignore the council's recommen dations, a well publicized step in any event.

Criticism of this bill included the concern about the bureaucratization of the government to which this would contribute; added expense to the public; the lack of confidence it assumes in the private sector (see especially the section on foreign investment); and the worry that independence from government does not assure "dispassionate and impartial inquiry."

Government Members speaking on the bill did not compare the merits of an economic council versus those of the white paper process. Only Mr. Martin saw similarities of purpose between the two. One Member, however, did compare the membership of the proposed economic council to that of Executive Council: "The 30-member cabinet has particular responsibilities for various areas of the economy, and I think they would be a lot more efficient than any 30-member council....Of the various duties of the council that (Mr. Martin) sets forth in his bill, most are now being done by the government and private industry."[23] Trying to establish the redundancy of such a proposal, Mr. Purdy tangentially pointed to the role the white paper process plays in keeping the governing pary in touch with Albertans.

The argument here is that among several reasons why the government is not interested in an economic council to form a principal role in industrial policy formulation, the fact that such a council would not permit the governing party to directly test the waters of public, interest group, and corporate opinion is surely among them. Whereas an economic council could from the perspective of the government inordinately represent certain groups' views over others', the white paper process ensures that the government becomes sensitive and responsive to the constituency it deems important for the party's continued success and the province's economic prosperity.

This is not to say that an economic council will not be created in future. Like others, this government at times bows to fashion. If voting patterns change, and if intra-Legislature opposition becomes a force to be reckoned with in offering a viable alternative, the opposition function of the white paper process will become superfluous, and the government may choose to contribute to the institutionalization of economic planning.

The White Paper and Federal-Provincial Relations

The white paper contains a few refernces to the federal government, some of them to illustrate the deleterious effects of "intrusive" government intervention in the economy; and two to federal attempts to articulate a national industrial strategy. A tension of sorts exists in the white paper -- between the promotion of the universal (trans-jurisdictional) operation of market forces, and yet the need for the province to politically circumscribe the operation of the market in the interests of self-reliance and prosperity. This tension embodies an aspect of federal-provincial relations.

The white paper contains a distinction between supportive and intrusive market intervention, which is based on whether such intervention aids, facilitates, or enhances the market, or whether it obstructs its operation. This distinction is actually the Alberta view of federal-provincial relations, at least as it has existed in the past decade or two. The Alberta government conceives the province as one of great opportunity which opportunity would be tapped if government played a minimal economic role. The federal government has not shared this view, a fact demonstrated to Albertans by the hardships brought upon Alberta by federal economic policies.

The white paper lauds federal efforts to create a national industrial strategy,[24] and in priciple supports a harmonized national market -- Alberta could only benefit from an efficiently operating market, the government contends. However, the province refuses to be the sacrificial lamb, resting on and practicing its free enterprise outlook while other jurisdictions exploit Alberta's potential. Hence the need for a provincial economic strategy that outlines the government's commitment to the market, yet which proposes a wide range of policies that, in the eyes of some of the government's supporters, elevated it to the level of entrepreneur.

To cite on of a plethora of examples, we may look to a submission made be the President of Northland Bank -- a regional, Calgary-based financial -institution -- at a white paper public forum. At one point it was

mentioned that "the confrontation on atmosphere between Ottawa and Provincial Governments must be transformed someway or other to consensus."[25] A few moments later, it was said that "in Alberta we have no choice but to assert our own leadership in the presence of a national vacuum. I see it, frankly, as the Premier himself stated, we are Canadians first. We are Albertans second. That does not suggest that we are not capable in Alberta of advising a strategy that the rest of the country might embrace and welcome."[26]

Keith Alexander, the MLA for Edmonton-Whitemud and a member of the steering committee, responded to these comments by equating Alberta's proposed strategy with "economic rationality:" "...we are not at the risk of balkanization if we decide to pursue a rational economic policy in the presence of either a national vacuum...but worse than a vacuum, a specific national will to do something that you and I don't consider to be rational."[27] The unfortunate fact is that it is increasingly difficult for the federal government to fill that vacuum when provinces opt for increasingly provincialistic approaches to the national economy. With respect to the breaking down of barriers in the interest of national market harmonization, ALberta is saying with its industrial strategy to the other provinces, "After you, Alphonse."

Conclusion

This paper has attempted to examine the white paper on industrial strategy with reference to the style of government associated with Premier Lougheed and to federal-provincial relations in Canada. The reasons for the white paper are found in considerations extending beyond the immediate demands of industrial policy formulation. The white paper is also an expression of the Alberta government's unwillingness to sacrifice provincial economic autonomy and prosperity for the sake of wider national visions it fells are legitimizing fabrications rather than concrete realities.

This last point is particularly poignant in light of some of the

comments David Peterson made in his first speech as Premier to the Ontario Legislature recently:

> ...our top priority is protecting the interests of the people of this province. Every policy we pursue, every piece of legislation we introduce, will be based on that principle....The federal government must bear one thing in mind: you have to keep stroking the engine that generates the nation's growth. That is good for all Canadians.28

The same words could easily have come from the lips of the Premier of Alberta. Inter-state federalism is alive and well and functioning in Canada.

Notes

1. P, Lougheed, speech to the Edmonton Chamber of Commerce, July 11, 1984.

2. Grant Notley, quoted in Calgary Herald, July 13, 1984.

3. Alberta, "White Paper: Pposals for an Industrial and Science Strategy for Albertans: 1985 to 1990" (Edmonton: July, 1984) p. 42.

4. Ibid., p. 43.

5. Ibid.

6. Ibid., pp. 57-8.

7. Ibid., p. 39.

8. Ibid.

9. A,D. Doerr, "The Role of White Papers," in G.B. Doern and P. Ancoin, eds., The Structure of Policy-Making in Canada (Toronto: Macmillan, 1971) pp. 182-6. See also A.D. Doerr, "The Role of Coloured Papers," Canadian Public Administration (Fall, 1982) XXV:3, pp. 366-79.

10. Doerr, "The Role of White Papers."

11. M. Jenkin, The Challenge of Diversity: Industrial Strategy in the Canadian Federation (Ottawa: Science Council of Canada, 1983) pp. 12 -3.

12. An appended copy of the advertisement contain further details about the forums.

13. The submissions to the white paper forums can be categorized by source as follows (figures are percentages of total number of submissions made at the forums): individuals, 5%; educational institutions, 13%; companies (including Crown owned), 19%; associations/interest groups (including political parties), 46%; government bodies (including municipal bodies), 17%; other, 3%.

14. This is the term Lou Hyndman used in the House with reference to the task force on tax policy. Alberta Hansard, May 28, 1985, p. 1196.

15. Department of Tourism and Small Business pressrelease, June 20, 1985.

16. The policy formulation stage is not yet complete. The remaining statements will be released probably in autumn, 1985.

17. P. McCormick, "Politics After the Landslide: The Progressive Conservative Caucus in Alberta" Parliamentary Government (1983) IV:1, pp. 8-10.

18. Ibid, p. 8.

19. Ibid., p. 9.

20. Alberta Hansard, May 9, 1985, p. 902.

21. Ibid., p. 903.

22. Ibid.

23. Ibid, p. 904.

24. White paper, pp. 41-2.

25. Transcript of submissions to the white paper public forum, Calgary, September 13, 1984, p. 150.

26. Ibid., p. 152.

27. Ibid., p. 160.

28. Quoted in editorial, Globe and Mail, July 3, 1985, p. 6.

APPENDIX

Public Forums On Industrial & Science Strategy For Albertans 1985 to 1990

What the Forums Are All About

The Alberta Government has produced a White Paper entitled "An Industrial & Science Strategy for Albertans 1985 to 1990", and now invites provincial groups, local organizations and individuals to join in the dialogue and present their ideas and views about the white paper.

Larry Shaben, Hugh Planche, Dick Johnston and Keith Alexander, M.L.A.'s, will conduct public forums for this purpose and will schedule presentation times for submissions. Priority will be given to province-wide organizations and time may not permit all submissions to be heard by the committee, but all written briefs will receive careful consideration.

Where and When

The public forums will commence on Monday, September 10, 1984 and end on Friday, September 28, 1984 at the following locations, dates and times:

Red Deer (Capri Centre)	Monday, September 10, 1984 9:00 a.m. - Noon; 2:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.
Fort McMurray (Peter Pond Hotel)	Tuesday, September 11, 1984 9:00 a.m. - Noon
Lloydminster (Wayside Inn)	Tuesday, September 11, 1984 3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
Medicine Hat (Continental Inn)	Wednesday, September 12, 1984 10:00 a.m. - Noon; 2:00 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.
Calgary (Palliser Hotel)	Thursday & Friday, September 13 & 14, 1984 9:00 a.m. - Noon; 2:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.
Edmonton (Edmonton Inn)	Tuesday & Wednesday, September 25 & 26, 1984 9:00 a.m. - Noon; 2:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.
Grande Prairie (Trumpeter Inn)	Thursday, September 27, 1984 9:00 a.m. - Noon
Peace River (Travellers Motor Hotel)	Thursday, September 27, 1984 2:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.
Lethbridge (El Rancho Motor Hotel)	Friday, September 28, 1984 10:00 a.m. - Noon; 2:00 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.

Contact Your M.L.A.

Individuals wishing to make their views known are encouraged to do so through their M.L.A. who will make arrangements to meet with them. Government M.L.A.'s will be advertising locally when they will be available to meet with individuals.

Your written ideas are especially welcome.

For information or copies of the White Paper, please call 427-2251 in Edmonton 8:00 a.m. - 10:00 p.m. OR 297-6464 in Calgary, 8:00 a.m. - 4:30 p.m., Monday - Friday. If you are dialing long distance— Please access these numbers through the R.I.T.E. operator.

Alberta
GOVERNMENT OF ALBERTA